

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action mailed on June 07, 2006, rejected all claims. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Shimura et al. (US 6,095,656). In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Shimura in view of Hagihara et al. (US 5,504,545). Further, claims 6, 7, 14 and 15 were objected to the relative term "about" which renders the claim indefinite. Applicants submit that claims 1, 6 and 7 are amended; claims 3-5 and 8-15 are canceled; claims 16-23 are newly added; and claim 2 remains unchanged as previously presented. Support for the new claims 16-23 are fully supported by the previously claims and the interrelated parts of the specification. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and new claims 16-23 are respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

Claims Objections

Claims 6, 7, 14 and 15 are objected to the relative term "about" which renders the claim indefinite. In response thereto, Applicants have amended claims 6 and 7, and canceled claims 14 and 15. As such, the claims are submitted in allowable form as currently amended.

Claims Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimura et al. '656.

In response to the rejection to claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), Applicants have incorporated the limitations of claim 3 into the original claim 1, and hereby traverses this rejection. As such, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 2 are novel over the Shimura et al. '656.

Claims Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Shimura et al. '656 in view of Hagihara et al. '545. Applicants have amended the previously claim 1 by incorporating the limitations of claim 3 with the same.

In response to the rejection thereto, Applicants traverse the rejections and submit claim 1, as amended, is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Shimura et al. '656, Hagihara et al. '545, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

With respect to claim 1, as amended, recites in part: A backlight module, comprising:

a bottom plate; and

a plurality of lamps disposed separately over the bottom plate, wherein the bottom plate has a plurality of first areas with lower reflectivity **underneath the lamps...**

... the first areas comprise a plurality of lower-reflectivity films disposed on the bottom plate, and the second areas comprise a plurality of higher-reflectivity films disposed on the bottom plate.

The aforementioned claim 1 discloses forming the first areas with lower reflectivity by disposing a plurality of lower-reflective films on the bottom plate, and forming the second areas with higher reflectivity by disposing a plurality of higher-reflective films on the bottom plate.

Shimura et al. '656 teaches a backlighting apparatus including a first optical element 280 having a region 285 with low reflectance thereon (Fig. 2). The Examiner contended that item 280 (first optical element) reads on the bottom plate as required in claim 1 (See page 4 of the current Office Action). However, Applicants submit that the first optical element 280 that is also interpreted as reading on the higher-reflective films by the Examiner **could not also be disposed on itself (the bottom plate)**. Therefore, Applicants submit that Shimura et al. '656 fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every element in the claim 1 for **"disposing both the lower-reflective films arranged underneath the lamps and the higher-reflective films on the bottom plate"**.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Hagihara et al. '545 fails to teach, disclose, or suggest modifying any apparatus as shown in Shimura et al. '656 by arranging the lower-

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

reflective films underneath the lamps and disposing both the lower-reflective films and the higher-reflective films on the bottom plate.

Hagihara et al. '545 teaches an illuminating apparatus including a base 6 and a reflecting means 16 disposed on the base 6, wherein the reflecting means 16 consist of a first reflecting member 17 and a second reflecting member 18. It is noted that **the first reflecting member 17 is arranged underneath the fluorescent lamp 2A and has reflectance higher than those of the base 6 and the second reflecting member 18.** The Examiner contended that items 17 (the first reflecting member) read on the higher-reflective films as required in claim 1 (See page 4 of the current Office Action). However, Hagihara et al. '545 discloses "arranging the higher-reflective ones (the first reflecting members 17) underneath the lamps", which teaches away from the proposed modification to arrange the lower-reflective films underneath the lamps.

See MPEP §2143.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), each of three requirements must be met. First, the reference or references, taken alone or combined, must teach or suggest each and every element in the claims. Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references in a manner resulting in the claimed invention. Third, a reasonable expectation of success must exist. Moreover, each of the three requirements must "be found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant's disclosure." See MPEP §2143.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

Based on the above, Applicants submit that Shimura et al. '656 fails to *teach or suggest each and every element in the claims*. Further, Hagihara et al. '545 teaches away from the proposed modification to arrange the lower-reflective films underneath the lamps, as required for claim 1. Thus, *there lacks of suggestion or motivation to combine the illuminating apparatus of Hagihara et al. '545 and the backlighting apparatus of Shimura et al. '656, and the reasonable expectation of success does not exist*. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, as currently amended, and its dependent claims 2, 6 and 7 are not rendered obvious by Shimura et al. '656, Hagihara et al. '545, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

New claims

Claims 16-23 are newly added. Applicants submit that claims 16-23 are novel and unobvious over Shimura et al. '656, Hagihara et al. '545, or any of the references of record, and thus should be allowed.

With respect to claim 16, which is added by incorporating the original claim 1 with claim 4, recites in part: A backlight module, comprising:

a bottom plate; and

a plurality of lamps disposed separately over the bottom plate, wherein the bottom plate has a plurality of first areas with lower reflectivity underneath the lamps ...

... the bottom plate is disposed with a first film with lower reflectivity and a plurality of second films with higher reflectivity, the second films are disposed on the first film to

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

form the second areas with higher reflectivity, and a plurality of areas of the first film not covered by the second films form the first areas with lower reflectivity.

The aforementioned claim 16 discloses disposing a lower-reflective film on the bottom plate to form the first areas with lower reflectivity underneath the lamps and disposing a plurality of higher-reflective films on the lower-reflective film to form the second areas with higher reflectivity. Applicant submits that such a backlight module as set forth in claim 16 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Shimura et al. '656, Hagihara et al. '545, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Shimura et al. '656 teaches a backlighting apparatus including a first optical element 280 having a region 285 with low reflectance thereon (Fig. 2). The Examiner contended that item 280 (first optical element) reads on the bottom plate as required in claim 1 (See page 5 of the current Office Action). However, Applicants submit that the first optical element 280 that is also interpreted as reading on the higher-reflective films by the Examiner **could not also be disposed on itself (the bottom plate).** Therefore, Applicants submit that Shimura et al. '656 fails to teach or suggest each and every element in the claims. Further, Shimura et al. '656 fails to teach disposing second films with higher reflectivity on the first film with lower reflectivity and arranging the lower-reflective areas underneath the lamps.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Hagihara et al. '545 fails to teach, disclose, or suggest modifying any apparatus as shown in Shimura et al. '656 by arranging the lower-reflective films underneath the lamps.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

Hagihara et al. '545 teaches an illuminating apparatus including a base 6 and a reflecting means 16 disposed on the base 6, wherein the reflecting means 16 consist of a first reflecting member 17 and a second reflecting member 18. However, Hagihara et al. '545 discloses "arranging the higher-reflective ones (the first reflecting members 17) underneath the lamps", which teaches away from the proposed modification to arrange the lower-reflective films underneath the lamps and dispose both the lower-reflective films and the higher-reflective films on the bottom plate.

See MPEP §2143, as discussed above, Applicants submit that Shimura et al. '656 fails to *teach or suggest each and every element in the claims*. Further, Hagihara et al. '545 teaches away from the proposed modification to arrange the lower-reflective films underneath the lamps, as required for claim 16. Thus, there lacks of suggestion or motivation to combine the illuminating apparatus of Hagihara et al. '545 and the backlighting apparatus of Shimura et al. '656, and the reasonable expectation of success does not exist. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 16, as newly added, and its dependent claims 17-19 are not rendered obvious by Shimura et al. '656, Hagihara et al. '545, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

With respect to claim 20, which is added by incorporating the original claim 1 with claim 5, recites in part: A backlight module, comprising:

a bottom plate; and

a plurality of lamps disposed separately over the bottom plate, wherein the bottom plate has a plurality of first areas with lower reflectivity underneath the lamps ...

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

... the bottom plate is disposed with a plurality of first films with lower reflectivity and a second film with higher reflectivity, the first films are disposed on the second film to form the first areas with lower reflectivity, and a plurality of areas of the second film not covered by the first films form the second areas with higher reflectivity.

The aforementioned claim 20 discloses disposing a higher-reflective film on the bottom plate to form the second areas with higher reflectivity and disposing a plurality of lower-reflective films on the higher-reflective film to form the first areas with lower reflectivity underneath the lamps.

Shimura et al. '656 teaches a backlighting apparatus including a first optical element 280 having a region 285 with low reflectance thereon (Fig. 2). The Examiner contended that item 280 (first optical element) reads on the bottom plate as required in claim 1 (See page 3 of the current Office Action). However, Applicants submit that the first optical element 280 that is also interpreted as reading on the higher-reflective films by the Examiner **could not also be disposed on itself** (the bottom plate). Therefore, Shimura et al. '656 **fails to teach or suggest each and every element in the claims**. Applicant submits that such a backlight module as set forth in claim 20 is not anticipated by the Shimura et al. '656. Accordingly, claim 20 and its dependent claims 21-23 are novel over Shimura et al. '656, and thus should be allowed.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/7116212
Docket No.: 13640-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Sept. 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw ; usa@jcipgroup.com.tw

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.